

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MANUEL MELENDEZ,

V.

DWIGHT NEVEN, et al.,

Petitioner,

Case No. 2:15-cv-02076-JAD-VCF

Respondents.

Order Granting Enlargement of Time

[ECF No. 72]

Petitioner, v. DWIGHT NEVEN, et al.,	Order Granting Enlargement of Tim [ECF No. 72]
Respondents.	

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that respondents' motion for enlargement of time [ECF No. 72] is **GRANTED**. Respondents have until July 9, 2020, to answer to the remaining claims of Petitioner Manuel Melendez's Second Amended Petition.¹

Melendez initiated this habeas action over four and a half years ago in October 2015.² Given the age of this case,³ counsel for both parties are directed to prioritize the briefing in this case over later-filed matters. **Further extensions of time are not likely to be granted absent compelling circumstances and a strong showing of good cause why a response could not be filed within the extended time allowed despite the exercise of due diligence.**

Dated: May 29, 2020

Jennifer A. Dorsey
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

¹ ECF No. 51.

2 ECF No. 1.

³ Habeas actions are civil actions under federal practice and are subject to the reporting requirements of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 (“CJRA”), 28 U.S.C. § 471 *et seq.* The CJRA sets a three-year goal for resolution of each civil case on the merits, *id.* § 476(a)(3), and encourages “setting, at the earliest practicable time, deadlines for filing motions and a time framework for their disposition,” *id.* § 473(a).